

**quinn emanuel trial lawyers | new york**

51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor, New York, New York 10010-1601 | TEL (212) 849-7000 FAX (212) 849-7100

March 26, 2021

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NO.  
(212) 849-7150

**VIA ECF AND ELECTRONIC MAIL**

WRITER'S EMAIL ADDRESS  
**michaelcarlinsky@quinnemanuel.com**

Hon. John P. Cronan  
United States District Court Judge  
Southern District of New York  
Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse  
500 Pearl Street  
New York, NY 10007-1312

Re: In re Garrett Motion Inc. Securities Litigation, 1:20-cv-07992-JPC

Dear Judge Cronan:

On behalf of our clients, Olivier Rabiller, Alessandro Gili, Peter Bracke, Sean Deason, Russell James, Carlos Cardoso, Maura Clark, Courtney Enghauser, Susan Main, Carsten Reinhardt, and Scott Tozier (the "D&O Defendants"), we write to request a 14-day extension of time, from April 12, 2021 to April 26, 2021, to submit our Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Amended Complaint. Plaintiffs consent to the requested relief.

Plaintiffs and the initially-served defendant Su Ping Lu agreed, in a stipulation filed with the Court on December 8, 2020 (ECF No. 24), that Plaintiffs' Consolidated Amended Complaint would be filed by February 25, 2021, and the defendant would move, answer, or otherwise respond no later than April 26, 2021.

In December 2020, Plaintiffs asked Quinn Emanuel to accept service of process on behalf of the D&O Defendants. Rather than burden Plaintiffs with the months-long process of serving, under the Hague Convention, the many D&O Defendants located outside the United States (including in Switzerland and Italy), we accepted service on their behalf in exchange for being able to file our anticipated Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Amended Complaint on the same date as Ms. Lu, April 26, 2021. Had we declined to accept service, and Plaintiffs were instead required to effect service of process via the Hague Convention, it is unlikely that many of the D&O Defendants would have been served by now.

On January 11, 2021, Plaintiffs wrote to the Court (ECF No. 26) memorializing the parties' agreement that Defendants would respond to the Consolidated Amended Complaint no later than April 26, 2021, that Plaintiffs would file their opposition no later than June 25, 2021, and that Defendants would file any reply no later than July 26, 2021.

On January 21, 2021, the Court issued an Opinion and Order (ECF No. 27) and set February 25, 2021 as the date for Plaintiffs to file their Consolidated Amended Complaint and April 12,

**quinn emanuel urquhart & sullivan, llp**

AUSTIN | BOSTON | BRUSSELS | CHICAGO | HAMBURG | HONG KONG | HOUSTON | LONDON | LOS ANGELES | MANNHEIM | MUNICH |  
NEUILLY-LA DEFENSE | NEW YORK | PARIS | PERTH | SALT LAKE CITY | SAN FRANCISCO | SEATTLE | SHANGHAI | SILICON VALLEY |  
STUTTGART | SYDNEY | TOKYO | WASHINGTON, DC | ZURICH

2021 as the date for Defendants to answer or otherwise respond to the Consolidated Amended Complaint.

We respectfully submit that April 26, 2021 is an appropriate date for filing our Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Amended Complaint. This was the core bargain that the D&O Defendants agreed to in exchange for waiving service. It was important to them to ensure their counsel had adequate time to prepare their anticipated Motion to Dismiss, and they were willing to forgo their rights under international law and their home jurisdictions for this benefit. At the time we agreed to the proposed schedule with Plaintiffs' counsel, we were aware that it is not uncommon in this District for defendants to have 60 days in which to respond to a consolidated amended complaint in a securities class action. In this case, Plaintiffs' Consolidated Amended Complaint is nearly 100 pages long and consists of nearly 300 paragraphs. Its allegations of purported misstatements span more than 30 pages against eleven individually situated D&O Defendants, on whose behalf counsel will need to make particularized arguments concerning, *inter alia*, scienter and control-person liability. Further, Plaintiffs' action arises out of a complex spin-off transaction for a company that is currently in bankruptcy, which also requires familiarity with complex transactional structures and aspects of bankruptcy law.

For the foregoing reasons, we respectfully request an additional 14 days—until April 26, 2021—to file our Motion to Dismiss, as previously stipulated between the parties.

We have not previously sought this relief.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michael B. Carlinsky

Michael B. Carlinsky

cc: All counsel of record (via ECF)

Pursuant to 6.A of the Court's Individual Rules and Practices in Civil Cases, any party seeking to file a motion, must submit a pre-motion letter. Defendants' letter filed March 26, 2021, Dkt. 35, shall serve as the pre-motion letter.

Defendants' request is granted. Defendants shall file their motion to dismiss by April 26, 2021. Plaintiffs shall file their opposition by June 25, 2021. Defendants shall file any reply by July 26, 2021.

SO ORDERED.

Date: March 26, 2021

New York, New York



JOHN P. CRONAN

United States District Judge